

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The amendments to the Figures were originally requested in the August 16, 2010 Amendment and Response and are NOT supplemented.

## **REMARKS**

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on September 23, 2010 with Applicant's representative Thomas A. Turano in which potential clarification of the claims was discussed.

### **Drawing Objection**

The response to the Drawing objections was addressed in the Amendment and Response filed August 16, 2010 and has not been supplemented.

### **Specification Objection**

The response to the Specification objections was addressed in the Amendment and Response Filed August 16, 2010 and has not been supplemented.

### **Status of Claims**

Prior to entry of the Amendment and Response filed August 16, 2010, claims 1-53 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 9-12, 15, 16, 19-22, 26, 30, 32, and 34-36 are amended herein. Claims 2, 4-8, 17, 23-25, 27-29 and 37-53 are herein cancelled. New claims 54-56 are added. Thus, upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3, 9-12, 15, 16, 18-22, 26, 30-36, 54-56 will be pending and presented for further examination.

Applicant believes that the amendments to the claims introduce no new matter.

### **35 USC §§ 101**

The Examiner had rejected claims 1-53 under 35 USC §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant submits that the claims as amended overcome this basis of rejection in that independent claims 1 and 20 as amended recite a computer and database and specific steps executed by that computer and database. Applicant submits that as claimed the invention relates to a specific machine and hence is allowable under Bilski.

35 USC §§ 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12-19, 37, and 40-52 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) unpatentable over Burke (US 6,112,191) (“Burke”). Claims 4, 7-11, 20-36, 38, 39 and 53 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Burke in view of Baker (US 2004/0093302) (“Baker”).

Applicant submits as amended claims 1 and 20 overcome these bases of rejection.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

A method of distributing donations to one or more charitable organizations through the sale of merchandise, the method comprising:

associating, in a database, a plurality of parameters with each item of merchandise for sale, the parameters specific to each item of merchandise, each parameter being set by one of a donor of the item of merchandise, a supplier of the item of merchandise, and a vendor of the item of merchandise;

the parameters comprising: a list of charitable organizations eligible for the receipt of a donation, a purchase price for each item of merchandise, a donation amount for each item of merchandise, a total price for each item of merchandise, and an allocation as a percentage of the donation amount to one or more charitable organizations on the list, the total price comprising the sum of the purchase price and the donation amount;

offering, by a computer, an item of merchandise in response to the values of the plurality of parameters associated with the item of merchandise;

communicating, by the computer, information about the item of merchandise to a purchaser, the information comprising the purchase price, the donation amount, the identity of the one or more charitable organizations on the list, and the donation amount to be allocated to the one or more charitable organizations upon the purchase of the item of merchandise and in response to the plurality of parameters; and

receiving from the purchaser an offer to purchase of the item of merchandise for the total purchase price including the donation amount.

That is, claim 1, as amended, recites associating, in a database, a plurality parameters with **each item** of merchandise. The parameters are specific to each individual item of merchandise (for example a specific shirt) and not the class of merchandise in general (all available shirts of that type). Thus, if various items of merchandise were identical shirts, each specific shirt, although identical with all the other shirts, would have its own set of parameters and the parameters would not necessarily be the same for each shirt. Each item of merchandise includes a set of parameters and each parameter is set by a donor of the item of merchandise, a supplier of the item of merchandise, and/or a vendor of the item of merchandise.

The parameters include a list of charitable organizations eligible for the receipt of a donation, a purchase price for each item of merchandise, a donation amount for each item of merchandise, a total price for each item of merchandise, and an allocation as a percentage of the donation amount to one or more charitable organizations on the list. The total price includes the sum of the purchase price and the donation amount. Further, the percentage of the donation amount can range from 0-100%. Finally, a computer performs the associations and the communication of the information to the purchaser.

Similarly claim 20 as amended recites:

A method of allocating proceeds to one or more charitable organizations from a sale of the item of merchandise, the method comprising:

associating, in a database, a plurality of parameters with each item of merchandise for sale, the parameters specific to each item of merchandise, each parameter being set by one of a donor of the item of merchandise, a supplier of the item of merchandise, and a vendor of the item of merchandise;

the parameters comprising: a list of charitable organizations eligible for the receipt of a donation, a purchase price for each item of merchandise, a donation amount for each item of merchandise, a total price for each item of merchandise, and an allocation as a percentage of the donation amount to one or more charitable organizations on the list, the total price comprising the sum of the purchase price and the donation amount;

receiving offers to purchase the item of merchandise from one or more bidders, each of the offers comprising an offer price;

selecting, by a computer in response to the offers and the parameters, one of the offers as a winning offer;

designating the bidder who submitted the winning offer as a purchaser of the item of merchandise;

communicating, by the computer, to the purchaser an indication that the purchaser's offer was accepted and the list of one or more charitable organizations;

receiving from the purchaser an identity of one or more charitable organizations to which a portion of the winning offer price is to be allocated; and

allocating, by computer, a portion of the winning offer price to said one or more charitable organizations.

Again, the list of parameters is associated with **the specific item** of merchandise, and the computer, in response to an offer and the list of parameters for that specific item, selects an offer as the winning offer, and provides the purchaser with a list of charitable organizations from the parameter list for the specific item selected.

Support for these amendments is found at least in paragraphs 9, 19, 51, 79, 82, 86-88 of the instant application. For example, paragraph 86-88 state:

[0086] In an embodiment, the method provides an inventory source logic with the ability to uniquely identify and tag individual tickets by source of inventory to differentially: 1) serve and populate a list of potential charities from which the purchaser may choose to donate; 2) allocate percentages of the donation amount to the same list of charities; and/or 3) serve and populate the list and create unique rules for allocation among the list of charities.

[0087] In an embodiment, it further provides the ability to associate individual tickets with a specific ticket source and/or a specific charitable organization. In practice, this means that some Team A tickets can be used to raise money for Charitable Organization A while other Team A tickets can be used to raise money for Charitable Organization B. Also, we may get Team A tickets from Source A and some Team A tickets from Source B. We can link Source A's Team A tickets with a different charitable organization(s) from Source B's Team A tickets. For example, some Celtics tickets can be used to raise money for United Way of America while other Celtics tickets can be used to raise money for the Shamrock Foundation--at any rate from 0% to 100%. Also, we may get some Celtics tickets from a Season Ticket Holder and some Celtics tickets from the team directly (or some third-party source such as the players, corporate sponsors, etc.). We can link a Season Ticket Holder's Celtics tickets to a different charitable organization(s) from the teams own Celtics tickets.

[0088] Further, it is possible to predetermine that for a specific ticket, X % goes to Charitable Organization A based on some third-party preference (e.g. the team, corporate sponsor) and permitting the customer to select one or more charitable organizations to receive an equal (or otherwise split) allocation of the remainder of the premium. For example, for all Red Sox tickets, 20% of the premium would be automatically allocated to the Red Sox Foundation (based on the preference of the Red Sox as a ticket source). The remaining 80% of the premium could be allocated to charities selected by the purchaser from our predetermined list.

Baker and Burke on the other hand both simply describe systems which offer merchandise for sale and permit purchasers to buy that merchandise. In Baker for instance the system is merely an intermediary between the ticket holder and the purchaser. Burke describes a system in which an excess amount provided by the purchaser is provided to accounts specified by the purchaser. Thus, neither Baker nor Burke teach or suggest associating a set of parameters with each specific item of merchandise and distributing money paid for the merchandise according to the parameters associated with that specific item of merchandise.

The associating of the parameter list with the item of merchandise and not the merchandise class means that all items of merchandise in the class of merchandise do not have to be treated the same. Thus two identical bottles of soda or two identical seats at an event can have, but do not have to have, different values associated with them. Thus one bottle of soda or one seat may be offered with different percentages of the purchase price going to the same or even different charities from the other bottle of soda or event seat.

As a result, how the items are offered and what choices the purchaser has increase significantly. For example in the case of substantially identical seats at an event, the vendor can choose to offer for sale first the seat that results in the most percentage of the purchase price going to charity or could offer both seats and their respective percentages of their purchase prices to the prospective purchaser and let the purchaser decide which to buy.

None of the prior art of record provides this ability.

Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 20 overcome the basis of rejection and are now allowable and that claims 3, 9-16, 18, 19 and 21, 22, 26, 30-36 and 54-56 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If, in the Examiner's opinion, a telephonic interview would expedite the favorable prosecution of the present application, the undersigned attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss any outstanding issues, and to work with the Examiner toward placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 28, 2010

/Thomas A. Turano/

Thomas A. Turano

Registration No.: 35,722

Attorney for Applicants

K&L GATES LLP

State Street Financial Center

One Lincoln Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02111-2950

Tel. No.: (617) 261-3148

Fax No.: (617) 261-3175